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1.1 Purpose

Module evaluation is an important feedback tool to capture the student experience of teaching, learning and assessment. The collation of this feedback and consideration of the quantitative and qualitative data received should be considered as part of each school/institute’s programme monitoring processes, alongside other sources of information such as student performance data and academic input.

In order to ensure that students feel able to provide honest feedback, module evaluations should be anonymous and processes have been designed to ensure that individual students cannot be identified from evaluation responses.

1.2 Scope

1.3 Module evaluation is carried out for all undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes, including associate schemes, joint honours or distance learning programmes and Educational Development programmes. It does not cover research degrees or non-award bearing continuing education.

1.3.1 Process

Overview

QMUL uses an internet-based survey management tool called Evasys to run the module evaluation scheme. This system allows QMUL to use both paper and online surveys as appropriate for the school/institute or teaching provision. ARCS has responsibility for managing the system and producing the data extracts and reports as well as organising the administration of the evaluations themselves.

Schools and institutes can ‘opt-in’ or ‘opt-out’ of using the centrally-administered system. The majority of schools and institutes opt in to the centrally-administered scheme where ARCS manages the process from setting up the surveys, to identifying the modules to be surveyed and scanning the information into the system. Schools and institutes (or disciplines) that have opted out of the central scheme (for specific reasons approved by the VP SETL) have responsibility for setting up surveys and running data collection for themselves. However, they are still required to include the QMUL core statements and return the responses for these statements to ARCS (see below).

The standard QMUL questionnaire for taught modules comprises ten core statements and three open text questions. The standard questionnaire for dissertation or taught modules has eight core statements and three open text questions. Statements are scored on a five-point Likert scale. QMUL has adopted this scale because it is used in the NSS, and hence will allow some comparability with NSS data.

Schools and institutes can request additional statement/questions to be included as long as the questionnaire does not exceed two A4 sides if using a paper survey. There are no formal limits on the length of online surveys but schools/institutes are advised to adhere to a similar number of questions.

Whether a school/institute is ‘opt-in’ or ‘opt-out’, it is expected that it will have a clear internal procedure for running module evaluations that is operated in a transparent and consistent way and understood by students and staff. This procedure should be based on the following principles:
Evaluations are carried out at an appropriate time (usually weeks 8-12 of the semester but other times may be agreed if modules run outside standard semesters)

- Student anonymity is maintained
- Students are informed about the purpose of evaluations and how to complete the surveys
- If using paper forms, teaching staff should not be present in the room when students are completing surveys nor should they handling completed evaluations. Instead a student volunteer should be selected to take the forms directly to the main student office or administrative contact

Schools and institutes should also have a clear internal process as to how the data produced by evaluations is reviewed and considered. It is expected that Student Staff Liaison Committees (SSLCs) are provided with this information in addition to other academic committees.

Schools and institutes should inform ARCS at the beginning of each academic year of the administration contact for module evaluation and the name(s) of people who should receive the module reports for review.

More details on the operation of the scheme, including the core statements, deadlines and guidance on use of data can be found at:

http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality-assurance/student-feedback/student-module-evaluation/

1.3.2 Paper vs Online

Practice over the years has shown that paper questionnaires receive a higher response rate than online equivalents. For this reason, many schools and institutes use paper forms despite the higher administrative burden this causes.

However, the nature of some provision means that it may need to be operated using online surveys. This may include collaborative provision, distance learning modules and project and dissertation modules. Students are contacted directly via their college email with a personalised link to the survey so it is important that school/institutes encourage students to check their email and complete the questionnaire in order to ensure good response rates. In addition, it is possible to add a block to the relevant module page on QMplus that will show students they have an evaluation to complete. The block is designed so that it only appears if there is a survey open – it is hidden at any other time. Please contact ARCS if you would like to add this block to your QMplus pages.

1.3.2 Informal feedback questionnaires

Several schools/institutes/disciplines run mid-semester informal module evaluation questionnaires in order that the current cohort can benefit from immediate action taken in response. Schools and institutes are encouraged to continue this good practice.

1.4 Evaluation and consideration of the data

A series of reports is available from the data collected by schools/institutes as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Production method</th>
<th>Time of report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full module report</td>
<td>Summary of all responses for individual module including open comments</td>
<td>Generated via Evasys</td>
<td>After every evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core report</td>
<td>Averages for core eight statements organised by school/institute and level of programme. Used on website for module selection (not sent to schools/institutes)</td>
<td>Generated via Evasys</td>
<td>After every evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-low scoring modules</td>
<td>High-low scoring modules in the school or institute. This will include raw data and response rates calculations</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>End of semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module vs school/faculty averages</td>
<td>Individual module results compared to school/institute and faculty averages</td>
<td>Generated via Evasys</td>
<td>End of year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/institute summary report</td>
<td>Aggregated school/institute results (all questions)</td>
<td>Generated via Evasys</td>
<td>End of year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/institute average vs faculty average</td>
<td>Aggregated school/institute results compared to aggregated faculty results (core statements only)</td>
<td>Generated via Evasys</td>
<td>End of year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR module summary reports</td>
<td>Full year aggregated results for each school/institute. Results compared to faculty and previous year’s scores.</td>
<td>Generated via Evasys</td>
<td>End of year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APR module summary reports – associates</td>
<td>Full year aggregated associates responses for each school/institute. Results compared to aggregated associate results for faculty</td>
<td>Generated via Evasys</td>
<td>End of year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4.1 **Dissemination to staff**

The full module report will be sent to the named contacts (see section 1.3.1) who are expected to review the data and determine if there are any concerns which the school/institute may need to address. Therefore, it is expected that the report recipients should be senior members of staff such as the Director of Education. Once this review has taken place, schools/institutes can disseminate the reports to other staff for consideration. However, in some instances modules may have very low numbers of respondents. The Vice Principal (Education) and the Deans’ for Education have agreed that in the cases of module reports with fewer than 5 respondents, Heads of School / Institute Directors should determine whether or not to pass on the full report to module leaders to protect the anonymity of the students.

1.4.2 **Dissemination to students**

Module evaluation data should be made widely available to students in each school/institute/discipline. Summaries of module evaluation data should be made available on websites and discussed with students at Student-Staff Liaison Committees (SSLC). Verbatim free-text comments should not be shared with students unless the school / institute has ‘cleaned’ the comments to remove any remarks that could identify any individual, whether student or staff.

Schools and institutes should ensure that students are kept informed of the actions taken and outcomes achieved where problematic issues have been identified. When feeding back to students it is good practice to use the approach of ‘tell us …. we listen’.
After the SSLC has considered it, module evaluation data should then be seen by Teaching and Learning Committees, together with any comments from the SSLC. Any issues identified as needing more consideration should be forwarded to school/institute boards for further consideration.

Within faculties, the Dean for Education (or equivalent) is responsible for monitoring module evaluation and its operation across all schools/institutes, and will also consider summary data for all module evaluation within the faculty. For the purposes of monitoring across the institution, summary data will be provided in the school or institute’s annual programme review, and may be included in the summary report on the Annual Programme Review process written by ARCS.

At the end of semester B, reports are produced for each of the taught modules evaluated in the previous two semesters showing the quantitative responses for the ten core statements. These reports are published on the ARCS website so that they can be viewed by students during the module pre-selection process for the next academic year.

Further information can be found in the guidelines for the use of module data document on the ARCS website:

http://www.arcs.qmul.ac.uk/quality-assurance/student-feedback/student-module-evaluation/
Core statements for taught modules 2019/20

Statements to be measured on a 5 point Likert scale:

1. The module is well taught
2. The module is intellectually stimulating
3. The module is well organised and runs smoothly
4. The criteria used in marking have been clear in advance
5. Feedback on my work has been returned in accordance with the stated deadlines
6. I have received helpful comments on my work
7. The library resources (e.g. books, online services) have supported my learning well
8. The use of QMplus has made an appropriate contribution to this module
9. Module-specific resources (e.g. equipment, facilities, software, collections) have supported my learning well
10. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of the module
11. The module has helped me develop skills which will be useful to me beyond my degree (QMUL Model modules only)

Free text questions:

1. What are the best things about the module?
2. In what ways could the module be improved?
3. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the module?
Core Statements for Dissertation / Project modules 2019/20

Statements to be measured on a 5 point Likert scale:

1) I am happy with the support I received for planning my dissertation/project (topic selection, outline, literature review etc.)
2) My supervisor had the subject knowledge to adequately support my dissertation/project
3) My supervisor had the appropriate skills to advise me about research strategies and methods
4) My supervisor provided helpful feedback on my progress
5) My supervisor provided feedback on written and/or practical work in accordance with internal deadlines
6) The criteria used in marking on the dissertation/project had been made clear in advance
7) I was able to access adequate learning resources to support my research/project
8) Overall, I am satisfied with the dissertation/project supervision I have received

Free text questions:

1) What was the best thing about undertaking a dissertation/project?
2) What would you change?
3) Do you have any other comments about your experience of undertaking your dissertation/project?